

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in view of Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) and in further view of Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in view of Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) and in further view of Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further define the invention. No new matter is believed to be added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method of fabricating a liquid crystal display device including, in part, "... forming a plurality of first photoresist portions, a plurality of second photoresist portions, and a plurality of third photoresist portions, ... , and wherein the first photoresist portions correspond to the plurality of light shielding portions, the second photoresist

portions correspond to the plurality of light transmissive portions, and the third photoresist portions correspond to the plurality of semi-transmissive portions; ... forming a pixel electrode on the passivation layer, wherein the pixel electrode contacts a side edge portions of the drain electrode ." None of Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submits that claim1 and claims 2-6, 8-13 and 15-17, which depend therefrom, are allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in view of Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) and in further view of Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

As an initial matter, Applicants note that claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 through claim 6 and includes by reference all of the elements of claim 1. As Applicants have discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254). Applicants submit that neither Kim (US 6,255,130) nor Park et al. (US 6,287,899) cures the deficiencies of Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) with respect to claim 1 as identified above, and that Park et al. (US 6,335,276), Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254), Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899) analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 7, which indirectly depends therefrom, are allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276), Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254), Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in view of Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) and in further view of Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

As an initial matter, Applicants note that claim 14 depends from independent claim 1 and includes by reference all of the elements of claim 1. As Applicants have discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254). Applicants submit that Park et al. (US 6,287,899) does not cure the deficiencies of Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) with respect to claim 1 as identified above, and that Park et al. (US 6,335,276), Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899) analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 14, which depends therefrom, are allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276), Sasano et al. (US 5,402,254) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-17 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Date: December 11, 2008

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000